

From: Christopher Joseph Kurecka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a college student and starter of a small computer consulting business. I have in many ways more knowledge of computers than most adults, and in all my experience with Microsoft, they have only done what is needed to sell a product.

Their technical support, though better than some other computer companies, is still simply horrid. They even charge for technical support on products that they sell at virtually 100% profit. I know that they put great amounts of research into some of their technical developments, but in many cases their alleged efforts don't result in gains for the consumer.

Microsoft makes bloated, slow software, simply because faster computers are out and they need a circular system of slowing down the CPU to demand faster CPUs to keep the market going. The cost of Microsoft products is far too high - especially when one considers that Windows itself, along with Office and other applications, are quite unstable and error-prone. If Windows cost \$30, then I might not care. But they have been steadily raising the price of Windows over the years, and I believe that if left unchecked they will continue to raise prices indefinitely.

Microsoft's plan for subscription service for Windows also frightens me. Their strategy of charging by the month or year for Windows is outrageous - it will increase the cost of Windows even more, because you pay for it whether you want to upgrade to new features or not. It will also lessen the motivation on Microsoft's part to innovate, once they have a more reliable, consistent money flow. As things stand today, people could all switch to Linux, and Microsoft would go bankrupt (not that such a thing would likely happen, but it's possible). In the subscription service, Microsoft is ensured a greater sum of money in a more consistent fashion that could cause me - or anyone else - to pay money even if they don't want Windows anymore. A good example: I like my computer to be in a dual-boot setup. I can use Linux for fun, and Windows when I need to use Office or something that I couldn't otherwise run in Linux. However, with this plan, I can keep updating Linux for free, and never upgrade Windows. With the subscription model, I would have to pay for Windows, even if it is only used as a secondary operating system.

I think that Microsoft should be forced to produce Office and their other flagship products for other platforms, such as Linux and Unix. I also think that they should be forced to restrict their pricing system, and be forbidden to ever go to a subscription payment model. Making Windows open

source or something to that effect would definitely be a significant boon to the tech industry, but it would also be a crushing blow to Microsoft that I think at present their actions do not warrant (though they may at some time in the future).

Thank you very much for your time to read this message, and for pursuing this antitrust investigation. Microsoft's anticompetitive behavior is definitely hurting the industry, and they don't innovate nearly as much as they like to make people think they do.

Christopher J. Kurecka